

2005 NAIP Survey  
Executive Summary  
For  
Ohio

USDA  
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

## **Contents**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Pages</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.1 Purpose and Scope</b>	
<b>1.2 Survey Submittals</b>	
<b>2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary</b>	<b>4-5</b>
<b>Executive Summary Supplemental Documents (Detached):</b>	
<b>Executive Summary Supplemental 1 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 13 (MS Word)</b>	
<b>Executive Summary Supplemental 2 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 14 (MS Word)</b>	

## Section 1

### 1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season “leaf on” imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

### 1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in Ohio. In other words, “How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?” Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

### 1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, OR, OK, KS, NE, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, **OH**, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery “late”. Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

## Section 2

### 2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via the State Office and responses were requested by 15 Dec 05. Out of the responses received, in Ohio, 2132 of a possible 3120 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .683, for a rating of 68.3%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of “Satisfied” nudging towards a rating of “Neither Satisfied or Unsatisfied”. The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, there is a good deal of room for improvement.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around color quality/resolution, and timing of imagery acquisition. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below. Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Q6, “Is the imagery useful for measurement services?” Statistically, the highest scoring question was Q1, “Was the imagery received by your office in time to be useful for crop compliance work?”

Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5	
Mean	4.035087719	Mean	3.647058824	Mean	3.226415094	Mean	3.12962963	Mean	3.071428571
Standard Error	0.137021924	Standard Error	0.150355212	Standard Error	0.191702913	Standard Error	0.197903576	Standard Error	0.181594618
Median	4	Median	4	Median	3	Median	3	Median	3
Mode	5	Mode	3	Mode	5	Mode	4	Mode	4
Standard Deviation	1.034492841	Standard Deviation	1.073750984	Standard Deviation	1.395618273	Standard Deviation	1.45428834	Standard Deviation	1.176867631
Sample Variance	1.070175439	Sample Variance	1.152941176	Sample Variance	1.947750363	Sample Variance	2.114954577	Sample Variance	1.385017422
Kurtosis	0.715564521	Kurtosis	-0.756986885	Kurtosis	-1.192575112	Kurtosis	-1.318225667	Kurtosis	-0.765689624
Skewness	-0.974745308	Skewness	-0.247510148	Skewness	-0.20152555	Skewness	-0.195628151	Skewness	-0.238560998
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	230	Sum	186	Sum	171	Sum	169	Sum	129
Count	57	Count	51	Count	53	Count	54	Count	42
Q6		Q7		Q8		Q9_X2		Q10_X2	
Mean	2.923076923	Mean	3.2	Mean	3.46	Mean	6.714285714	Mean	7.464285714
Standard Error	0.203376761	Standard Error	0.190141648	Standard Error	0.164651766	Standard Error	0.315934283	Standard Error	0.267217852
Median	3	Median	3	Median	3	Median	6	Median	8
Mode	1	Mode	3	Mode	3	Mode	8	Mode	8
Standard Deviation	1.466570681	Standard Deviation	1.202561369	Standard Deviation	1.164263803	Standard Deviation	2.364235688	Standard Deviation	1.999675298
Sample Variance	2.150829563	Sample Variance	1.446153846	Sample Variance	1.355510204	Sample Variance	5.58961039	Sample Variance	3.998701299
Kurtosis	-1.309740397	Kurtosis	-0.732299393	Kurtosis	-0.324831294	Kurtosis	-0.531898401	Kurtosis	0.415611253
Skewness	-0.017213928	Skewness	-0.219762353	Skewness	-0.424671271	Skewness	-0.398335753	Skewness	-0.674246089
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	8	Range	8
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	2
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	152	Sum	128	Sum	173	Sum	376	Sum	418
Count	52	Count	40	Count	50	Count	56	Count	56

## 2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results

